

November 1, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 5359

Because I had heard repeatedly that City Councilmen supporting the measure (all of them did) got nasty, threatening letters from sportsmen and other opponents, I went through correspondence files (by permission). There were some emotional, strongly-worded letters, but the most menacing merely said they would never again vote for said Councilmen if they supported the bill. The truly significant thing, however, was the almost total absence of letters favoring the measure.

The backers of Bill 560, as it was known before enactment, claimed the support of "hundreds of thousands" of women. At a public hearing on whether 560 should become law, exactly 8 of these clubwomen appeared. So I made the rounds of several Councilmen's offices to see if the city's conscientious housewives and bustling businesswomen had deluged City Hall with feminine notes professing to want Bill 560.

In one Councilman's office, I was graciously permitted to go through the entire file on the subject. I personally checked and double-checked every letter received. There were approximately 125. Without exception, they opposed Bill 560. Not a solitary letter favored it. I turned to the Councilman and said, "I understand there was a lot of support for this bill. Is there another file?" The Councilman assured me that was the "complete" file. "What about letters from those hundreds of thousands of women?" I asked. The Councilman replied, "I guess we didn't get many." "Any," I corrected.

At another Councilman's office down the hall, the Councilman's assistant told me, "We got about a hundred letters on it, I guess." I asked, "What was the ratio of those for and against?" "Oh, about 90 opposed it and the rest thought it was all right."

From a third Councilman's office I got the same story.

The "several hundred thousand women" represented by club officers as being ardently in favor of the law apparently failed to write even a postcard in favor of it. As Councilman Gaetano Giordano remarked to me, "There was a lot of phony support."

I asked a woman community leader why she supported the bill.

"The opponents of the bill kept saying they had to defend their homes," she said indignantly. Now, I ask you, in this day and age? This isn't the frontier any more." In her next breath, the lady said: "By the way, did you know that during those riots we had here a couple of years ago, that the rioters stole 3,000 guns from pawn shops and sporting goods stores?"

The Philadelphia City Council totals 17 members and it is virtually impossible, for one reason or another, for an individual to poll the entire membership. The Councilmen voted unanimously for the gun law. If any of them have changed their minds, the only one who said so to me was Councilman Giordano, a delicatessen operator representing the city's 2nd District. He now thinks the law is "a joke" and would vote "No" if he has another chance.

Boys From Syracuse**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1967

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, the 174th Tactical Fighter Group, the world famous "Boys from Syracuse," celebrated its 20th anniversary.

The group was founded on October 28, 1947, by Lt. Col. Michael C. Malone as a component of the organized State militia. The first meeting was attended by only a handful of men, 16 officers and 35 airmen. Out of that small number, however, the group's present leader, Col. Curtis Irwin, has molded one of the most capable fighting units ever assembled.

Over the years, the "Boys from Syracuse" have been the recipients of numerous awards and citations. In 1963, they were cited as the outstanding unit of the New York Air National Guard and they received the NYANG commander's trophy. The following year, they received the TAC Achievement Award for flying safety, and in 1965, they were awarded the Pentagon's On-the-Job Unit Achievement Award from the National Guard Bureau for the most outstanding training program. That same year, they received the Gen. Lewis Evans Boutwell Award as the most combat-ready jet fighter group in the entire 102d Tactical Fighter Wing.

During the Berlin crisis of 1965, the "Boys from Syracuse" were called up to fly ground support missions for the U.S. 7th Army serving in France. Their service was most commendable and won widespread acclaim.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the headquarters area for the 174th Tactical Fighter Group, which is located at Hancock Field in Syracuse. I am prouder still to represent these valiant airmen who have dedicated themselves to the freedom and security of America.

Needed: Interstate Attack Against Air Pollution**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, air pollution does not respect political boundaries.

As President Johnson, who has provided great leadership in this field, said in January when he sent the administration's suggested air pollution program to the Congress:

Winds carrying waste gases have no respect for manmade political boundaries. The question we must answer is: Shall we, the victims of pollution, hinder our fight against it by concerning ourselves more with artificial boundaries than with our people's health?

Today, although many of our severest pollution problems involve more than one State jurisdiction, there is not a single effective interstate program in the Nation. Efforts to achieve uniform control activities among neighboring States and communities have failed, despite added Federal financial incentives.

The Air Quality Act of 1967, which will be coming to the floor shortly for debate and vote, contains provisions to assure that there will be an interstate attack on air pollution: the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to indicate those regions, interstate in nature, which need to have air pollution treated

as a regional problem and for which planning commission funds will be provided by the Federal Government.

This provision is a vitally important one, and it is one of the many new provisions which cause me to say that I will support the bill when it comes to the floor.

The Kee Report: Antimissile Defense**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is antimissile defense. The report follows:

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

Our Government recently made one of the most important policy decisions in the history of the United States. It was also one of the most reluctant.

Because of the growing menace of the nuclear stockpile now being built by Red China, the Federal Government decided that a nuclear defense system is urgently needed to protect our country against sneak attack.

This defense line will be designed to protect against enemy missiles only, and not against invading ships or airplanes. It will cost about five billions of dollars and it is intended to guard our country at least until 1980. Because, eventually, a far more expensive defense system may be necessary, the newspapers describe the one now proposed as a thin defense.

Today's mass destruction weapons are deadly in execution. They are also complex enough in operation to baffle those of us who are untrained in the specialized field of science. Despite this fact, I shall now try to explain in non-technical terms how this defense system proposes to operate.

The new system will be composed of fifteen or twenty anti-missile batteries located at outposts in Alaska and Hawaii and along our extended coastlines. Please think of these batteries as automatic sentinels able to detect the approach of enemy missiles and geared to send up our own missiles to search and destroy. In other words, the job of the American sentinel is to seek out and explode the enemy missile before it lets loose its destruction upon our towns and cities.

It may require two years or more before this defense system is in operation. In addition to the construction cost of five billions of dollars, it will take 500 millions annually to keep it on operation.

The annual outlay for defense by the United States now exceeds the costliest year of World War II. The cost will climb each year. In other words, we are now engaged in the most terrifying arms race in human history, the pace of which seems to increase as each year goes by.

The American people are unanimous in their desire for peace. The American people are against war. The idea of conquering other people or other territories is contrary to every decent citizen. In the face of this, suppose we examine the national conscience to see if our Government is responsible in any degree for the current nuclear arms race.

The United States and its allies first unlocked the secret of the atom during World War II. As a result, they had a monopoly on the most destructive weapon ever invented.

They could have employed this monopoly for selfish purposes. Instead, in the grandest gesture in history, the United States and its allies offered to surrender this monopoly to international control in return for proper safeguards.

This offer came before the United Nations about 20 years ago. Every nation in the world voted to outlaw these mass destructive weapons except Soviet Russia and the satellite nations under the domination of Moscow. In other words, Stalin and Stalin alone plunged the world into the nuclear arms race. Since then, in defiance of world opinion, Red China has stepped up the pace by joining the nuclear club on a massive scale.

Since Stalin made his fateful decision, both the free world and the Communist nations have expended hundreds of billions on costly armaments and the end is not in sight. This is the dreadful burden which Communism has forced upon the whole human race.

Thank you for listening.

I Am an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the finer weekly newspapers in the Midwest, the Tazewell County Reporter in Washington, Ill., recently printed a prize-winning essay submitted to the Freedom Foundation by Cmdr. James C. Standish, U.S. Navy. The essay is really a letter or message if you prefer to the draft card burners, the demonstrators, and all the malcontents who have received so much undeserved publicity in recent weeks. I am under no illusion that this shabby crew would be persuaded by the commander's stirring comments but it should provide some ammunition for the great majority of young people on college campuses around the country who are opposed to all that the dropouts from reality have been espousing.

Under unanimous consent I include the editorial from the Tazewell County Reporter issue of October 26, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

I AM AN AMERICAN

(By Comdr. James C. Standish, U.S. Navy)

Burn your draft card, boy. Join the protest marchers, the teach-ins and ban-the-bomb demonstrators.

Because I am an American I'll protect your right of free expression of your ideas. But how about some help from you? Or am I asking too much in expecting you to help combat the communistic menace to your rights of free assembly and peaceable protest?

I understand your fears. I felt them in 1943 and again in 1952. I feel them again today. I will be afraid if I'm assigned to duty in Vietnam just as I was when assigned to the Pacific in World War II and to Korea in the Korean War. However, if so assigned I will go, because, as corny as it may sound, it is my duty to my country. I will go in the belief that it will help prevent my children from fighting the communists on U.S. soil at some later date; or preclude my opportunity for the likes of you to advocate surrender to communism at some later date.

I understand your ignorance of the real goals of communism since you have been influenced by a few idealistic, highly educated

boobs who inhabit an unreal world of theory. They chose to ignore the stated goals of world communism and its oft demonstrated means of obtaining these aims in the real world that most of us inhabit. They, and you, choose to ignore the lessons of history no matter how recent they may be.

I also understand that you have been reared in an era of parental permissiveness that breeds scorn for discipline, law and order. It appears to be an era that encourages you to disobey any rule that you disagree with or did not help make. I recognize this environment as the spawning ground for your shallow excuse of refusing to participate in the Vietnamese War because you did not participate in the decision to fight. Did you participate in drawing up the Bill of Rights? The Constitution? Did you participate in the past wars this country fought against tyranny and oppression? "Of course not. How old do you think I am?" you ask. Do you then reject your heritage as an American resulting from these actions because you were not a participant? Do not the majority of the voters of the country select the president and the other representatives to make the decisions for the people? In a democracy do those who were ineligible to vote or who voted for an unsuccessful candidate forfeit any of their rights and privileges as free citizens? Are they released from any of their responsibilities as citizens?

Child that you are, you want all the privileges of a free man but not his responsibilities. Knowing full well that in a free society such as ours, there are, always were and always will be parasites like you along for the free ride, I will still defend our freedom as long as I shall live.

I will protect our liberty despite your shortcomings as long as I shall live. I further hope to live long enough to see you learn the true meanings of liberty, freedom and communism, and then in spite of your fears, volunteer to serve your country. Only then, child, will you realize that freedom is not a free ride but it is secured and held at great cost.

Dr. King's Brand of "Nonviolence"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the proposal by Dr. Martin Luther King to close down Washington with a massive "camp-in" is deplorable. Nothing could damage the cause of social progress more than intimidation and threats.

I trust he will think better of his suggestion before the hotheads act on it.

The following editorial concerning this matter was broadcast by station WMAL here in Washington during the week of October 22, 1967, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

DR. KING'S BRAND OF "NONVIOLENCE"

Dr. Martin Luther King must have suffered a slip of the tongue when he advocated camping thousands of persons in Washington with the avowed purpose of disrupting the city. Such a remark hardly upholds Dr. King's image as a Nobel Peace Prize winner.

Yet Dr. King solemnly proclaimed that a gigantic "camp-in" may be "necessary" to "pressure" Congress into passage of a \$20 billion a year anti-poverty bill. Dr. King wants this bill to include guaranteed income, guaranteed jobs and plenty of other "guarantees."

We appreciate Dr. King's concern for social problems, but we deplore his suggested method of achieving his goals. It takes a devious twist of the imagination to picture the right of peaceful assembly extending to a "camp-in." There is no right to "make sure a city will not function", as Dr. King put it.

Dr. King should think twice. To attempt to dictate to Congress what laws it should pass, by use of threats and intimidation, is to damage the cause of social upgrading.

Obscene Material Available to Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1967

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, many constituents have communicated with me protesting the apparent lack of enforcing Federal laws with reference to the mailing of obscene materials.

Many letters concern the distribution of the November 1967 issue of Playboy magazine. The Columbus Dispatch on October 30, 1967, ran a news story entitled "Obscene Material Available to Children: Survey Shows Nudist Magazines Near Schools." The Columbus Dispatch is to be commended for its disclosure of the freedom of display and sale of obscene materials in the city of Columbus.

There is little wonder that juvenile delinquency mounts year after year when publications of this kind are so readily available to so many youngsters as soon as they are able to read.

Steps should be taken to prohibit the distribution of adult publications with sex as their major appeal, such as Playboy magazine.

In Playboy we find pseudoserious articles with displays of sex and nudity on alternate pages. Fathers add to the problem by bringing home for children to see these flashy mixtures of philosophy and philandering which make millions for their publishers.

The problem is, however, one for action at every level of government. The Federal Government should show the way by enacting new legislation which courts will accept and officers will enforce.

I am pleased to submit the above-mentioned article from the Columbus Dispatch for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEY SHOWS NUDIST MAGAZINES NEAR SCHOOLS: OBSCENE MATERIAL AVAILABLE TO CHILDREN

(By Graydon Hambrick)

Columbus citizens, including local school children, can find ready access to obscene reading material, depending on one's definition of obscenity.

You can pay 25 cents for a magazine such as Intimate, with its front cover headlines which promise much but offer little, to several dollars for nudist magazines showing boys and girls at play without clothes.

About the only "pornographic" magazines unavailable openly are extremely various sexual activities.

Courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court, are without consensus as to the definition of salacious literature, but some local maga-